



---

THE PAN-EUROPEAN IDEA

Author(s): ADOLPH E. MEYER

Source: *Advocate of Peace through Justice*, November, 1926, Vol. 88, No. 11 (November, 1926), pp. 615-618

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20661411>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Advocate of Peace through Justice*

# THE PAN-EUROPEAN IDEA

By ADOLPH E. MEYER

**V**IEWED historically, the idea of a federated Europe is by no mean entirely new. Fundamentally, the germ of such notion is, of course, contained in the hopes and aspirations of the Roman Cæsars, the Catholic Theocracy, the Holy Roman Empire, and Napoleon. True it is, to be sure, that all of these various ambitions differ considerably among themselves. The aims, scopes, methods, and results of no two of them are exactly alike. And yet, whatever their prominent discrepancies, they are, nevertheless, all characterized by at least one common element: They sought to impress upon a more or less loosely connected union of European nations a centralized governing authority. Superimposed by force and entirely oblivious of the rights of minorities, such central authority, in the attempt to crush dissenting nationalities, soon became disagreeably despotic, and in the ordinary course of events usually turned out to be the weaver of its own death shroud.

When the Italian ex-premier, Francesco Nitti, in his new book, "Peace," and more recently Chauncey Depew, on the occasion of his birthday, optimistically referred to the *United States of Europe*, neither of them, the present writer feels certain, had in mind this antiquated type of European centralization. Both of them were thinking rather of a government patterned somewhat upon the plan of the United States of America, in which state and federal powers are defined and differentiated. The United States of Europe, accordingly, would be a federation of States in which matters of general European interest and concern would be subject to central or federal control, whereas questions merely national in scope would be left to the jurisdiction of the particular nation involved.

While it is undoubtedly true that by far the greater part of the various plans aiming to establish a European confederation have in the past been theoretical rather than practical, nevertheless the fundamental purpose behind most of these plans seems no longer to be merely a

Utopian dream. Not only is the rank and file of the so-called pan-Europeans daily increasing, but definite steps have actually been undertaken to bring about the eventual establishment of the United States of Europe.

In the first place, several societies have been organized throughout Europe with the avowed and ostensible purpose of disseminating propaganda in the interests of the proposed confederation. Of such organizations the Pan European Union, with headquarters at Vienna, is probably the most influential.

The first public pronouncement suggesting the establishment of a European confederation was probably made by the French ex-Premier, Herriot, during his incumbency in office. The Frenchman's suggestion, it is worthy of note, was soon to receive the eulogistic endorsement of Stresemann, Germany's Minister of Foreign Affairs at that time. The fact that these two more or less practical statesmen expressed a favorable attitude towards the idea of a united Europe not only augurs well for the future, but also is actual proof that supporters of the proposed project are to be found not alone among the academic theorists. The statements of Herriot and Stresemann sounded a tremendous tocsin throughout Europe and served to focus attention upon the pan-European idea as nothing had heretofore. Very likely the most important step yet to be undertaken by the protagonists of the United States of Europe is the convocation of the first pan-European congress scheduled for the present year. Undoubtedly this convention will do much to bring the various purposes of the pan-Europeans into a somewhat clearer light.

That the various European nations must in time reach some kind of definite understanding based upon principles more satisfactory than those underlying secret treaties and military or commercial alliances seems to be the opinion of many of Europe's foremost thinkers. Continuance of Europe's traditional politics, it is believed, will in the end result in another war, with consequences infinitely more

direful and catastrophic than those following in the wake of the last European conflict. The necessity, moreover, of being prepared for such a struggle entails a tremendous economic burden which even a successful war could hardly be expected to compensate. Adequate proof of this assertion is the present financial plight of the victorious Allies.

It is, furthermore, pointed out by careful students of European affairs that the more Europe is inclined to cling to its old ways, the more dependent it will become upon other continents. Especially in an economic sense does this contention seem to be significant. While the present writer is not prepared to accept the sinister prediction which presumes to prophesy the eventual destruction of the European peoples, yet in the event of their adherence to their traditional policies, there seems to be much cause indeed for serious concern.

What is especially worthy of notice with regard to the pan-European movement is the fact that a definite program has been set up. In other words, the realization has finally dawned that wishes alone, desirable as these may often be, are after all only beggars on horseback, and that to bring about a European confederation a great deal of definite action becomes necessary. What is probably the clearest as well as concisest statement of purposes yet set forth is that formulated by the Pan European Union. This organization sees in the proposed establishment of the European United States (1) a preventive against war, (2) a way towards eventual disarmament, (3) the promulgation of a European Monroe Doctrine, (4) the neutralization of Europe in the event of a war involving other continents or geographical groups, (5) a means of assuring Europe of its power to compete economically with foreign interests, (6) an effective weapon to combat the spread of disgruntled radicalism.

Incidentally, it should be pointed out that the Pan European Union is a staunch opponent of Bolshevism. Moreover, like the United States of America, the United States of Europe would guarantee to the various component States a certain measure of local freedom. This respect for individual nationalities is refreshingly dif-

ferent from the older idea of European centralization, based upon conquest and operated by force.

Opposed to the plan of a federated Europe are many factors. There are, in the first place, the multifarious influences of nationalism, ranging all the way from a mild and salutary patriotism to crass and selfish chauvinism. The doctrines of communism, too, are in sharp conflict with the ideals of a federated Europe, since the latter type of government would not disestablish private ownership nor abolish capitalism. A certain measure of opposition is also to be expected on the part of the various military organizations, since the creation of a united Europe would, of course, obviate the necessity for any considerable soldiery. The most powerful and stubborn, and perhaps also the most dangerous, resistance is, however, to be expected on the part of those industrialists who are now deriving the major share of their profits by the protecting grace of a beneficent tariff. The federative character of pan-Europe would wipe out existing customs lines, and thus make the sale of goods dependent upon their inherent quality and lowness of price rather than upon favorable tariff protection.

Of this quartet of factors tending to oppose the establishment of a federal union of European States, communism and militarism, although undoubtedly formidable obstacles, are, nevertheless, not insurmountable. They are probably the weakest links in the chain of opposition. Nationalism is a more dangerous foe, since its appeal is to man's deep-rooted instincts and emotions. Without a doubt, much time and energy will have to be consumed before national prejudices are finally set aside. However, the ulcer of nationalism is not so bad that it cannot be removed. The United States of America is brilliant testimony of the fact that a people may be heterogeneous in composition and yet possess common purposes and ideals. The little Alpine Republic of Switzerland exemplifies an important exception to the time-honored contention that differences in language and religion, and even in race, are perforce a barrier to concerted action.

The strongest and most indomitable of the several opponents of the idea of a federalized Europe are without doubt the industrialists, who, in this particular case at least, have much to lose and little or nothing to gain. Facing economic disaster through the eventual inauguration of free trade among the various European nations, this group may be expected to fight a grim and desperate battle against pan-Europe. Before they relinquish any of their present material prosperity, the industrialists will bring into play every atom of their untold resources, which, it cannot be gainsaid, are considerable.

Aided, moreover, by their almost unlimited economic power, the industrialists are intrenched in a decidedly strategic position and wield powerfully effective weapons. What this group may be expected to do in order to retain their present advantages has been ably depicted by Dr. Richard Calergi, one of the most capable spokesmen of the new European idea. "They will," he thinks, "buy the newspapers and draw them into the service of their struggle; they will command books and articles written by economists, who will seek to prove that free trade among the nations of Europe portends the doom of Europe; they will attempt to excite England against the idea of a pan-European union; they will support nationalists and militarists and speak about 'national honor.'"

Besides these various impediments interfering with the organization of the United States of Europe, at least three further perplexing problems must be attacked and solved before any real progress can be made. It will be necessary, in the first place, to determine satisfactorily the relationship of Great Britain to any forthcoming European confederation. The same question will also have to be settled with regard to Russia. And, finally, the matter of the numerous European colonies lying outside of Europe must receive consideration.

Concerning the problem of England, the proponents of the pan-European idea are at present, so to say, divided into two camps. There are those who favor the inclusion of Great Britain in the United States of Europe. There are also those who strenuously object to such inclusion.

The former group cannot conceive of a United States of Europe without England. For them England is geographically an important part of the European continent. Racially, culturally, and historically, the island kingdom has much in common with the European mainland. Furthermore, it is pointed out that England is a nation rich and powerful, capable of bestowing upon any contemplated European federation that all-important and necessary touch of prestige and dignity which in the event of the exclusion of Great Britain would be conspicuously lacking. Those objecting to the admission of Great Britain to the pan-European federation, while admitting the force and significance of all these arguments, nevertheless point to some very practical reasons for their standpoint. They perceive in the British realm an empire so vast and so scattered that in truth the sun has been said never to set upon British domain. Considered from the point of view of square miles and number of population, the British realm would be larger than the rest of Europe, exclusive of Russia. Such an enormous intercontinental world can hardly be thought of as European.

It is, furthermore, contended that many of the special problems presented by these component parts of the British Empire are peculiarly non-European, and that in the interest of European solidarity and homogeneity such extra-European problems should, if possible, be avoided. Moreover, the opponents of English membership in the United States of Europe have pointed out that in the Pan-American Union this vexatious British problem has been given consideration, and that it has been solved by the non-admission of Canada to the Union. While the Pan-American Union is not exactly analogous to the United States of Europe, nevertheless the argument affecting Canada seems fairly appropriate in the case of England. However, whether in the long run England is included or not in any eventual European federal organization, both factions seem to agree that in the event of exclusion it will be necessary, for numerous practical reasons, to give England specific guarantees and assurances. In other words, in the interests of the United State of Europe, it will be absolutely es-



sential to work *with* rather than *against* England.

Concerning the relationship of Russia to a federation of European States, the problem is somewhat simpler than in the case of the British Isles. As a matter of fact, as long as Sovietism is the established form of Russian government, no real problem whatsoever exists. Acting upon principles as it now conceives them, the Soviet régime could hardly be expected to link itself with a group of nations fundamentally opposed to the tenets of communism. Moreover, since federal Europe would certainly not favor the extermination of capitalism, Russia would thus find another vital reason for the refusal of its active participation in the new Europe. It is also frequently asserted that the future of Russia lies to the east rather than to the west. In other words, the policy of Europeanizing Russia initiated by Peter the Great will in time be entirely abandoned. Industrially and socially, Russian interests will thus be stressed in the East.

However, although the exclusion of Russia in the United States of Europe seems to be mutually desired both by Russia itself and the adherents of the pan-European idea, nevertheless, as in the case of England, it will be necessary for the European union to assume an amicable and co-operative attitude toward the former subjects of the Czar.

With regard to the matter of European colonies outside of Europe, the question naturally arises whether or not such colonies should be included in any European federal organization. Those opposed to such inclusion advance very much the same arguments as in the case of Great Britain, viz, that the colonies are outside of Europe, that their size is too great, that they would tend to stir up unnecessary difficulties, and that they would disturb European harmony. The Pan European Union, however, sees the problem in a somewhat different light. Pointing out that most of the European colonies are situated in Africa, and that they are not scattered all over the globe, as in the case of England, this society is inclined to favor their admission to federal Europe. Such colonies, it is asserted, might be ad-

mitted to the European union as full-fledged States, as Territories, or as local self-governing units. The membership of the colonies in the European confederation is defended especially on the ground of industrial and economic necessity for Europe.

Whether or not the idea of a confederation of European States will ever be realized, no one can accurately foretell. Certainly it represent a magnificent aspiration—a world hope as well as a European hope. It will be the forerunner of permanent peace, the undisputed birthright of every human being. To be sure, there are the skeptics, who would remind us that the spirit may be willing, but that the human flesh is ever weak. To them, all that we can say is that the same difficulties beset our own American forefathers in their struggles for an American Union, and that, furthermore, even within memory of living man, the unification of Italy and the liberation of Ireland, once phantastic dreams, have become reality. In the words of Ex-Premier Nitti, "Times are changing. . . . Some things are happening today which in the days of my youth would have been relegated to the Arabian Nights fairy-tale class. . . . French, Italian, German unity is proof that even hatreds and passions that dominated for centuries and that seemed unconquerable may be dissolved and washed away."

## THE REVOLUTION IN POLAND

By H. CH. G. F. VAN DER MANDERE,  
General Secretary Netherlands League of  
Nations and Peace Society

THE observations made in the June number of this organ with reference to the revolution in Poland require supplementing somewhat here and there, in order to obtain a more complete insight of the external and internal relations of the Polish Kingdom, restored since 1918 to its independence.

Independent Poland was, at the end of the eighteenth century, divided, by three partitions, between Prussia, Austria, and Russia; but, despite the fact of these partitions, politically and economically, having taken place with refined cruelty, the